

REMARKS

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 in view of Ishiwaki (US 5,847,518), and claims 11-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 in view of Ishiwaki and Kawano et al. (US 5,736,917). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action admits that Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 do not disclose a coil winding without protrusions. Thus, the Office Action relies upon Ishiwaki for allegedly teaching, in FIGs. 4 and 5, "a bobbin wound with coil 4 and core 5 introduced into [the] bobbin which has a coil winding part without [a] protrusion member and the coil continuous wound from [one] side of the winding part to the other side." As a result, the Office Action alleges that it would be obvious to "have a bobbin without protruding member as taught by Ishiwaki to the prior art." In addition, the Office Action alleges that "[t]he motivation would have been to provide continuous winding for the coil." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Office Action's alleged motivation to modify Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 (i.e., to provide continuous winding for the coil) is neither taught nor suggested anywhere in Ishiwaki with respect to a bobbin provided with a coil winding part. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Ishiwaki actually teaches (col. 2, line 55 to col. 3, line 11) separating primary and secondary coils into first and second parallel bobbins sharing a common U-shaped core such that the windings of the first and second bobbins are performed in opposite directions in order to minimize potential differences between the first and second bobbins. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that combining the teachings of

Ishiwaki with Applicant's Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 would result in a transformer having three parallel bobbins sharing a common W-shaped core such that the windings of adjacent ones of the three bobbins would be performed in opposing directions.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that combining the teachings of Ishiwaki with Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 changes the principle of operation of Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2, thereby rendering the transformer of Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. For example, as shown in Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 and disclosed in paragraph [0008], "the winding parts 5a, 5b, and 5c wound with the coil 2 correspond to a low voltage area, a middle voltage area, and a high voltage area." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that modifying Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 with the teachings of Ishiwaki would not provide for low, middle, and high voltage areas.

As MPEP 2143.01 instructs, "[I]f proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984)." Furthermore, MPEP 2143.01 instructs, "[i]f the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious. *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959)." Accordingly, because modifying Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 with the teachings of Ishiwaki would fail to provide low, middle, and high voltage areas, which would render the transformer of Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 inoperable and unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, Applicants

respectfully assert that the Office Action has not established any proper motivation to modify Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2, and thus not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Applicants further assert that the Office Action does not rely on Kawano et al. to remedy the deficiencies of Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 and/or Ishiwaki. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Kawano et al. cannot remedy the deficiencies of Applicants' Prior Art FIGs. 1 and 2 and/or Ishiwaki.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of the applied prior art references, whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in amended independent claims 10 and 14, and hence dependent claims 11-13 and 15-17, respectively.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under

37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: _____



David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: June 8, 2004

CUSTOMER NO. 09629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 739-3000